

10/669,114

SNYD/24US

Remarks

Applicant is submitting herewith amended claims that clarify the subject matter sought to be protected. Specifically, these claims clarify the intended scope of the claims is for a firearm sight that includes a laser light source that generates a "sighting beam substantially parallel to the barrel of a firearm".

Laser sights for firearms are known, but have a number of drawbacks that limit their usefulness. Primarily, the sight must be turned on, which may present a major inconvenience in an emergency situation. The present invention is directed to a substantial improvement in laser sights, in which the sight is activated by detected motion. That is, if a weapon is moved, indicating it will be potentially used, the laser sight will activate, eliminating a step.

The Examiner has cited various prior art but none of this art discloses the inventive concept, specifically, a laser sight that includes a "motion detector" that will "activate [a] laser [sight]" when "detecting motion vibration indicative of handling of [a] firearm prior to firing".

10/669,114

SNYD/24US

Dye

The Examiner has cited Dye et al. '262, as anticipating the claims, yet Dye does not disclose a motion activated laser sight. Dye discloses a "laser tag" type training system in which a training weapon simulates the firing of shots, using blank cartridges. Laser pulses are generated by the training weapon when triggered, and those pulses are detected at the target to determine the targeting of the simulated shot. A piezoelectric crystal, stimulated by mechanical forces from the blank cartridge, creates electrical power for the laser.

Dye is thus distinct from the claims for at least the reason that it does not disclose a motion detector for detecting motion vibration "indicative of handling of [a] firearm prior to firing"; indeed, the Dye system generates a laser pulse only when the training weapon simulates firing, since the laser pulse is intended to simulate a bullet. It would contravene the purposes of Dye for laser pulses to be generated when a simulated shot is not being fired, as this would destroy the intended simulation.

Serraville

The Examiner has cited Serraville '488, as anticipating the claims, yet, again, Serraville does not disclose a motion activated laser sight. Serraville discloses a mercury switch

10/669,114

SNYD/24US

that activates a night vision light source when the weapon is at a particular angle relative to ground. Thus, in Serraville, it is the angle of the weapon, not vibration or movement, that triggers the light.

Serraville is thus distinct from the claims at least in that it fails to show a "laser light source for generating a sighting beam" and fails to disclose activating the light source on "motion vibration indicative of handling of said firearm prior to firing thereof". As Serraville intends his light source to be "on" when the weapon is within a chosen angle of horizontal, it would be contrary to his purposes for the light to be "off" when in this position, as would occur in the absence of motion under the present claims.

Snyder

The Examiner cites the Snyder et al. '670 patent as anticipating the claims, yet Snyder does not even disclose a firearm or weapon. Snyder deals with an aftermarket-installable shock detector for car alarm systems. There is no sighting function described in the Snyder patent. The lights illuminated by the Snyder system are to warn of vibration detection (i.e., an alarm), not for weapon sighting.

10/669,114

SNYD/24US

German

The Examiner cites the German '636 patent as anticipating the claims, yet again German does not disclose a laser sight. German discloses a bright light generation system for blinding and thus incapacitating an intruder. The bright light generator may take many forms, including the form of a shotgun shell, in which example the light source is powered by hammering a piezoelectric crystal with the shotgun firing pin (as shown in Figs. 7a-7b). However, even in the Fig. 7a-7b embodiment the light is not a "sight", nor is the piezoelectric material intended to detect "motion vibration indicative of handling of [a] firearm prior to firing thereof." Rather, the light illuminates when the shotgun is fired and its firing pin hits the piezoelectric. Accordingly, German neither teaches or suggests a light that illuminates on vibration that is "prior to firing", as claimed.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims as presented patentably distinguish each of the references cited by the Examiner, and respectfully requests early issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

10/669,114

SNYD/24US

A petition for a three month extension of time is attached to the transmittal of this communication. If, however, an extension of time is necessary to accompany this communication, please consider this paper a petition for such an extension of time, and apply the appropriate extension of time fee to Deposit Account 23-3000. If any other charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas W. Humphrey
Reg. No. 34,353

Wood, Herron & Evans, L.L.P.
2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2917

Voice: (513) 241-2324
Facsimile: (513) 241-6234